

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action of February 28, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-68 remain pending in the application. Applicant has not amended the claims in this response but has provided a copy of the pending claims for the Examiner's convenience.

Claims 1-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jois* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,242, hereinafter referred to as *Jois*) in view of *Moore* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,575, hereinafter referred to as *Moore*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 23 each recite, among other features, "automatically generating an updated web page layout responsive to receiving the style template selection signal." Applicant's invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art because the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* neither teaches nor suggests this feature of Applicant's claims 1 and 23. As acknowledged in the Action, *Jois* fails to teach or suggest this feature. (Action, pages 3-4). In response, the Action cites *Moore* in combination with *Jois* to teach this feature. Specifically, the Action cites Figure 7 of *Moore*.

The Action states, "the preview feature inherently shows that the updated webpage layout is automatically generated after selecting a style for the header to show how the web page is presented for previewing." (Action, page 4). In *Moore*, as shown in Figure 7, a user must first perform a selection operation to preview the Web page using the Development Tool. (See *Moore*, Figure 7). Any type of finished web page or preview web page again is not generated automatically responsive to receiving the style template selection signal. Therefore, the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* fails to teach or suggest, "automatically generating an updated web page layout responsive to receiving the style template selection signal," as recited, among other features, in Applicant's claims 1 and 23.

Independent claims 1 and 23 also each recite, among other features, "receiving a predetermined selection signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing at a selected predetermined region of the web page layout." Applicant's invention is patentably

distinguishable over the prior art because the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* neither teaches nor suggests this feature of Applicant's claims 1 and 23. The Action cites column 6, lines 14-25 as describing this feature.

Column 6, lines 14-25 of *Jois* describes a scheme for composing a Web page. Specifically, a master template defines a boundary and is composed of template tags that identify and mark the location for subtemplates to be inserted to create a Web page. "The template tags 510, 511 and 512 respectively identifies subtemplate #0, subtemplate #1 and subtemplate #2 and marks the location on the master template 500 where each is to be inserted by the composite Web page generator 240." The predefined subtemplates are defined by the master template. There is no description of a signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing at a selected predetermined region of the web page layout. Neither the cited portion, nor any other portion of *Jois*, teaches or suggests, "receiving a predetermined selection signal indicative of a user interface selection device pointing at a selected predetermined region of the web page layout." *Moore* fails to cure this deficiency of *Jois*. As such, for at least the above identified reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant's independent claims 17 and 39 each recite, among other features, "automatically generating an updated web page layout responsive to receiving the macro style template selection signal." Applicant's invention is patentably distinguishable over the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* for at least the same reasons as stated above with reference to Applicant's claims 1 and 23.

Independent claim 45 recites, among other features, "displaying a web page layout on a display" and "automatically displaying an updated web page layout in response to the received style template selection signal." Applicant's invention is patentably distinguishable over the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* for at least the same reasons as stated above with reference to Applicant's claims 1, 17, 23, and 39. In addition, the Action cites Figure 4 and column 5, lines 5-16 of *Jois* as describing Applicant's feature of, "displaying a web page layout on a display." As described by the cited portion, Figure 4 of *Jois* shows the display of a specific composite, interactive Web page. (Col. 5, lines 5-6). Figure 4 is the end result after a Web page has been created. "In one embodiment, associated with each listed item is an "add" button and a

Appl. No. 09/299,724
Response Dated March 30, 2005
Response to Final Office Action mailed February 28, 2005

“subtract” button. When a user mouse clicks an item’s add button, he or she is sending a buy order for the item to the server 200.” (Col. 5, lines 16-20). As described, this portion of *Jois* describes nothing more than a completed Web page, not “displaying a web page layout on a display, as recited in claim 45.

Applicant’s claims 2-16, 62-63, and 65-68, 18-22 and 64, 24-38, 40-44, and 46-61, which depend from claims 1, 17, 23, 39, and 45, respectively, are patentably distinct over the combination of *Jois* and *Moore* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicant looks forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: March 30, 2005

By: J. M. F.
John M. Fleming
Registration No. 56,536

1001 G Street, N.W.
Eleventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 824-3000